

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated June 16, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-30 are rejected by the Examiner. Claim 25 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-30 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,946,066 to Lee et al. (hereinafter "Lee"). Claims 2, 4-7 and 9-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,207 to Asada et al. (hereinafter "Asada").

The rejection of claims 1, 3, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Lee does not anticipate claims 1, 3, and 8 because Lee does not disclose either explicitly or inherently, each and every element of the claims.

Claims 1, 3, and 8 each recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "wherein the common line is formed on a different layer from the gate line." The Examiner in the Office Action cites Lee as disclosing the quoted feature referring in particular to FIG. 3A and column 2, line 60-65 of Lee. Applicants respectfully disagree that Lee discloses the quoted feature.

Lee, at column 2, lines 58-66, states the following:

The pixel electrode 14 includes a bar 14a bended in the same direction as the counter electrode, bisecting a space surrounded by the counter electrode 13 and a overlapping portion 14b connected to the bar 14a, extended parallel to the gate line 11 and overlapping the counter electrode 13. The overlapping portion 14b is contacted with the gate line through a given connection line.

The data line 12 is bended in the same direction as the counter electrode 14 and the pixel electrode 13.

Applicants submit that Lee, including the portions cited by the Examiner, is completely silent concerning the relative layer arrangement of the gate line and the common (counter) electrode. Applicants submit that Lee is further silent about the materials used in the gate line and the counter electrode and that Lee does not show or disclose that the counter electrode and

the gate line overlap or cross each other. Applicants submit that Lee does not disclose, either inherently or explicitly at least “wherein the common line is formed on a different layer from the gate line” as recited in claims 1, 3, and 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, and 8 are not anticipated by Lee.

The rejection of claims 2, 4-7, and 9-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Asada is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

With respect to claims 2, 4-7, and 9, Applicants note that claims 2, 4-7, and 9 each depends from claim 1 and each includes by reference all of the elements of claim 1.

As Applicants have discussed above claim 1 is not anticipated by Lee. In rejecting claims 2, 4-7, and 9, the Examiner cites Asada to cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Lee. Applicants submit that Asada does not cure the deficiencies in Lee related to “wherein the common line is formed on a different layer from the gate line” as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that Lee and Asada, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach all of the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, and claims 2, 4-7, and 9 depending therefrom are allowable over Lee and Asada.

Claim 10 recites a liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “at least one light shielding layer on the pixel region, the light shielding layer crossing the data lines, the data electrode, and the common electrode at respective ones of the data line bent portions, the data electrode bent portions and the common electrode bent portions, wherein the light shielding layer is formed on a different layer from the gate lines.” In the Office Action the Examiner cites Lee as teaching “the light shielding layer crossing the data lines, the data electrode, and the common electrode at respective ones of the data line bent portions, the data electrode bent portions, and the common electrode bent portions” referring in particular to FIG. 3B and column 3, lines 8-15 of Lee. Applicants submit that Lee, including the portions cited by the Examiner, does not describe a light shielding layer arranged as recited in claims 10. In rejecting claim 10, the Examiner states that claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1-9. However, none of claims 1-9 recite the above quoted element of claim 10.

Applicants submit that Asada does not cure the deficiencies of Lee. Applicants submit that Lee and Asada, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest “at least one light shielding layer on the pixel region, the light shielding layer crossing the data lines, the data

electrode, and the common electrode at respective ones of the data line bent portions, the data electrode bent portions and the common electrode bent portions, wherein the light shielding layer is formed on a different layer from the gate lines” as recited in claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, and claim 11 depending therefrom are allowable over Lee and Asada.

Claims 12-23 each recite an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “a plurality of auxiliary common lines on the bent portions of the data electrodes and the common electrodes.” Applicants submit that Lee does not teach at this quoted combination of features. In rejecting claim 12, the Examiner states that claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 10. However neither claim 1 nor claim 19 recites the quoted combination of features. Applicants further submit that Asada does not cure the deficiencies of Lee. Applicants submit that that Lee and Asada analyzed singly or in combination do not teach at least “a plurality of auxiliary common lines on the bent portions of the data electrodes.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 12-23 are allowable over Lee and Asada.

Claims 24-30 each recite an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including “common lines on the bent portions of the data lines.” In rejecting claim 24, the Examiner cites Lee as teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully submit that Lee does not teach at least “common lines on the bent portions of the data lines.” The Examiner cites Asada to cure the deficiencies of Lee. Applicants submit that no portion of Asada discloses or teaches a common line on a bent portion of a data line. Applicants submit that Lee and Asada, analyzed singly or in combination, do not teach at least “common lines on the bent portions of the data lines.” Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 24-30 are allowable over Lee and Asada.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 13, 2006

By 
Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No. 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicants